



Request for City Council Committee Action From the Department of Human Resources

Date: May 23, 2003

To: Ways and Means/Budget Committee

Prepared or Submitted by _____ Pamela French, 673-2139

Approved by _____, John Moir, City Coordinator

Subject: Request to Increase Salary

Presenters in Committee: Klara Fabry

Recommendation: Increase Adam Kramer, Director Water Works salary from Step C to Step D.

Financial Impact (Check those that apply)

☐ No financial impact or Action is within current budget.

☐ Action requires an appropriation increase to the Capital Budget

☐ Action requires an appropriation increase to the Operating Budget

☐ Action provides increased revenue for appropriation increase

☐ Action requires use of contingency or reserves

☒ Other financial impact (Explain): Salary would increase \$2061 annually.

☐ Request provided to the Budget Office when provided to the Committee Coordinator

Background/Supporting Information -

As a result of collective bargaining between the City of Minneapolis and the Minneapolis Public Works Engineers Association (MPWEA) the City was finally successful in removing the appointed engineers from the bargaining unit. The City of Minneapolis had been attempting to accomplish this for several years. Because they were represented by the MPWEA the City had not compensated them as other appointed employees are compensated, and they were not

provided any of the heightened benefits. In July of this year City and the Association filed a "Joint Petition" to the Bureau of Mediation Services formally completing the removal process.

Due to their removal, appointed Engineers should be treated as all other appointed employees other than political appointments. Two appointed positions in the Public Works Department were previously not represented by MPWEA and were already provided the compensation and benefits as other appointed employees. Those positions are Director, Administration and Director, Solid Waste and Recycling.

Adam Kramer, Director Water Works was placed on Step C based on the 5% rule, but his placement did not recognize his prior service in the same position. Based on prior service, he should have been placed on Step D rather than Step C. Effective date of the change is January 1, 2003.